



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ANNUAL BANQUET

THE WASHINGTON HOTEL, SATURDAY EVENING, APRIL 29, 1922

TOASTMASTER

DR. HARRY PRATT JUDSON

President of the University of Chicago

GUESTS OF HONOR

CHIEF JUSTICE WILLIAM H. TAFT

United States Supreme Court

HONORABLE JAMES JOHN DAVIS

Secretary of Labor

HONORABLE HENRY W. TEMPLE'

House of Representatives

MEMBERS AND GUESTS

Dean G. Acheson	Edward A. Harriman
Francis W. Aymar	Richard S. Harvey
Hollis R. Bailey	Charles H. Hastings
Mrs. Hollis R. Bailey	Harry B. Hawes
H. Campbell Black	David Jayne Hill
Ira H. Brainerd	Rexford L. Holmes
Philip Marshall Brown	Capt. Frank W. Hoover
Edward B. Burling	Manley O. Hudson
Mrs. Edward B. Burling	Charles Cheney Hyde
Wilbur J. Carr	Admiral Harry S. Knapp
Edward F. Colladay	Judge Martin A. Knapp
Charles Ray Dean	Baron S. A. Kroff
Mrs. Edith S. Elmore	Baroness S. A. Korff
George A. Finch	Honorable Robert Lansing
Joseph W. Folk	Admiral J. L. Latimer
Rev. James E. Freeman	John K. Loughlin
Arthur Geissler	Miss M. Pearl McCall
Johannes Gennadius	L. W. McKernan
William D. Goddard	William A. McLaren
Chauncey Hackett	A. B. Messer
Arthur Hale	Mirza Hussein Khan Alai
C. Froelich Hanssey	Denys P. Myers

Soterios Nicholson
 Admiral James H. Oliver
 Spero Papafrango
 Major Robert P. Parrott
 Frank C. Partridge
 Walter S. Penfield
 James K. Pollock, Jr.
 Chester D. Pugsley
 Jackson H. Ralston
 Admiral W. L. Rodgers
 George Rublee
 James Brown Scott
 Mrs. James Brown Scott
 Judge Kathryn Sellers

James M. Sheridan
 Mrs. James M. Sheridan
 Stanley P. Smith
 Theodore Stanfield
 Ellery C. Stowell
 Baron Edmund von Thermann
 Joseph J. Tunney
 Walter S. Ufford
 Honorable Alexander Vouros
 George G. Wilson
 Henry F. Woodard
 Lester H. Woolsey
 Paul Wooton
 J. Edwin Young

Dr. JAMES BROWN SCOTT. Ladies and gentlemen: I am requested, on behalf of the President of the American Society of International Law, Honorable Elihu Root, to express for him his regrets that he is unable to be with us tonight. I think I may also express on behalf of all of us who are present our keen regret that we are to be deprived this evening of the pleasure of having him with us tonight. In Mr. Root's absence, Dr. Harry Pratt Judson, President of the University of Chicago, has kindly consented to act as Toastmaster on this occasion, and I take pleasure in presenting Dr. Judson to you at this time.

The TOASTMASTER (Dr. Harry Pratt Judson). Dr. Scott, ladies and gentlemen: I sincerely share with you great regret that our President is not here, and not only do I share with you that regret, but I feel that I have a larger proportion of it than you can possibly have. I wish he were here from the bottom of my heart, for many reasons that I need not enumerate.

I have, before introducing the speakers, a word I would like to say on a matter connected with our Society. I have in my mind a little document given me by Dr. Scott. I want to make a plea for teaching our students in our colleges and higher schools of learning some of the fundamentals of international law. This subject is something that should be understood in its elements at least by every educated man. We know that Blackstone's Commentaries were written, by no means, as I understand it, to develop lawyers, but simply to enable young English gentlemen to know the laws of their country. And it seems to me that intelligent young Americans ought to know the laws of nations in order to understand the relations which are coming to be so vital,—the relations of one nation to another in this world. We have learned that no nation can live by itself alone; that the isolation of nations is gone. It once would do for China or Japan. It has gone even there, and it is much the same in every other part of the world. We are

getting more and more clearly every day in our minds, I think, the idea that we cannot live alone, that nations belong together, and that the order of the world and the prosperity of the world are united and that, therefore, the nations must understand one another. And for that reason I do think we ought to teach in our schools and colleges of the higher grade at least, the subject of international law and international relations.

Now, there has been a report made by the committee, with Dr. Scott in charge, showing some facts that I will take the liberty of reading. This report shows that in 1921, and also in 1911, that is in two reports ten years apart, there were 142 institutions teaching this subject and allied subjects; and they had in 1921, 6,785 students. This was an increase of 1,987 in that decade. In 1921 there were 83 institutions that had not been teaching it ten years before, with 2,205 students, a total of 8,990 students studying this subject in that year. Well, that sounds pretty well. There were 78 institutions which were offering these subjects in 1911, but not in 1921. There was in them a falling off of 1,474 students. It made a net increase of 2,718 students in the decade. Well, now, that as against a small number seems pretty large,—a good gain. I think it is appalling. It is discouraging,—the idea that these great colleges and universities do not have a larger number of young people who are being introduced into the elements at least of this subject, so vital I believe to everybody. I know of one institution that I shall not name, where something over 200 students are pursuing these subjects,—200 college students. In that institution there are nearly 5,000 students, not counting the graduates either, of whom there are 2,000 more, and out of those 5,000 undergraduate students only 200 were studying international law.

I am not pleading for a requirement that every student shall take this subject, but for putting the thing in such shape in all our colleges that our intelligent young men, and young women too, should be introduced to the subject of international law. Our subject is not, I take it, initiated to remedy all the evils in the world. There are several fields in the world that we cannot touch. There are many things in other nations that we would like to change perhaps. There are some things in our nation that some folks abroad would like to change. You can not remedy everything that is wrong in the whole world. But we ought to know what international law is, how it came to be what it is, what is the relationship of the United States to this subject, and what has been the history of the United States in its development. Those things, I think, belong to every intelligent man and woman, and those things can be taught in the colleges, and those things can be taught outside of the colleges, for men who have never seen a college are often our most intelligent people.

You will pardon me, ladies and gentlemen, for introducing the subject in the natural way of a pedagogue.

But now, as introducing the speakers, I am taking some liberties with

the program here. I find that the Chief Justice of the United States is first on our program, and at his request I am going to put him last. The reason is because he says he has nothing to say, and I want that said last of all! Therefore we begin with a speaker whose main functions are very closely akin to international law, I am sure, because if there were no labor in the world there would be no world or occasion for international law anyway, or any other kind of law. I take great pleasure in introducing first of all, the Honorable James J. Davis, an American, a thorough American, of Welsh ancestry, Secretary of Labor of the United States.

ADDRESS BY THE HON. JAMES J. DAVIS
Secretary of Labor

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: When Dr. Scott asked me to come to this dinner he extended me an invitation to come and chat with my friend, Mr. Albert Bushnell Hart, of Harvard. I therefore had an ulterior motive for coming to the dinner, because I expected it would save me a trip to Illinois. Prof. Hart and I are on the Board of Governors of the school at Mooseheart that takes care of the orphan children of the members of the Loyal Order of Moose. The school is located some thirty-five miles west of Chicago. I really was anxious to meet with Mr. Hart and discuss some of our problems, but inasmuch as he is not here, I shall tell you about some of the things the Professor and I were going to discuss.

This work of the Fraternity of the Moose is for the care and education of the orphan children of deceased members of the order. We have 1023 acres of ground, thirty-five miles west of Chicago, and the plant today could not be duplicated for five millions of dollars. We are probably teaching a new doctrine, of giving each child at least a high school education and teaching him a trade. We believe in the trade. After all, the law profession is just a trade, to my way of thinking. The lawyer specializes in his particular line of work as a tradesman. A craftsman specializes in his line of work. For instance, I am by trade a puddler. My work is somewhat different from the trade of a lawyer. If the lawyer wants to practice his trade in a foreign land, he must know, he must learn, another language. I can puddle in Wales, or France or Australia, or China, and the language does not make any difference to me, because I can earn my bread by the sweat of my brow without much change in life.

But, seriously speaking, I believe in teaching the boys and girls of America a trade. I think that if children are taught to make a living with their hands, they are perfectly safe in the world, and a trade is surely no handicap for them if they want to seek a higher education. I believe in education, although unfortunately I have not been in a school-house since I was eleven years of age. I started to work when quite a lad. I came into the country when I was eight years of age from Wales. I arrived in April

and started to work on Decoration Day. I always make Decoration Day my holiday, because it was the day I was welcomed to America and obtained my first position here. I am not learned in the law. I am learned in my trade, if I may put it that way; and that is what we are trying to do with these boys and girls at Mooseheart. We are trying to get this idea of teaching these children their trade into every school in this land. We have 1660 branches all over the country and all are now organizing to make the fight to give the children in every community an opportunity to learn a trade.

A trade is an education within itself, if you will just stop to think of it. When I was about twelve, I started with my father as his third hand puddler in a rolling mill, and as I was an inquisitive sort of boy, I said to my father "Where do we get the pig metal from?" And he, being a man educated in the school of experience took me by the hand, and in his way, after our day's work was over, took me up to the blast furnaces, and he said, "Son, I want to tell you where we get the pig metal from. Here is the ore that just came from up in the northwest. They treat it by rolling, and it is dumped here out of these cars, and you see this little stone, and the coal and coke. Well, they send it in the trams to the top and dump it into the blast furnaces, and when they pick the slag from the iron, these are the impurities that come from the iron. Then they tap the iron later." He showed me the pig metal, and we went into the mill where the puddler takes the rest of the impurities from the metal and produces merchant iron or muck iron. And then in the finishing mills he showed me the bar iron, and over here the hooble iron, and here the sheet iron, and here the plate iron, and here the nail factory. In those days they used to cut nails by hand. If a workman cut out twelve kegs of four or five penny nails a day, that was a big day's work.

My father demonstrated to me on that occasion, that a boy learning a trade has all of the opportunities for education lying ready to his hand. If he traces the materials and the tools that he works with, from the raw material to the finished product, on their way from field or mine or forest, to the ultimate consumer, he can lay the basis for a real education. All he needs is the desire to learn and to know. In acquiring his trade he will acquire the foundation of a liberal education, and to build upon that foundation rests with him alone. The man with a trade who seeks a higher education, who wants to be a lawyer, an international lawyer, a professional or business man of any kind, is better qualified than the man who lacks the training that comes from learning a trade. The man who is trained to work with hand and heart as well as with mind is better fitted for any position in life than the man who works with the mind alone.

International law has come to mean a great deal to me in the last few days. We have a bill pending in Congress now to provide for the enrollment and education of the alien who comes to our shores seeking the benefits of

American freedom of opportunity. We have found that we can provide for the registration and the education of our immigrants without running counter to any of the laws of nations, and by this means we propose to make a better America for immigrants and better immigrants for America. This problem is very close to me, for I was an immigrant myself, and I have lived all my life in a community made up largely of Welsh, and English and German immigrants. The fact that these people have made good citizens, despite the handicaps under which they labored, should prompt us to do everything that we can to enlarge their opportunities.

It is with this thought in mind that we propose the registration and education of the alien in America. We want to make clear to them the duties and obligations, as well as the privileges and opportunities of life in America. We want to see that they are fitted to take up these duties and to take advantage of these opportunities. We want to give them every chance to become good stalwart American citizens.

The Congressional committee which framed the registration bill debated as to whether the educational features of the plan should be made mandatory upon the alien, or should be left to his own voluntary action. They asked me about it and I said:

"If you had voluntary education for children in America, half of our children under fourteen years old would be in the workshop rather than in the school house."

If compulsory education is good for the children of America, surely it is good for those who come to us from abroad. We will be doing a tremendous amount of good not only for the alien but for ourselves if the government undertakes to educate the newcomer to our shores as to America and all that it means. The alien must know America, its traditions, its constitution, its laws, and its customs, if he is to make the most of his opportunities here. And America must make itself known to the alien, if the country is to acquire sturdy citizenship among those who come to us from other nations.

I know the immigrant and I know that he does not want coddling. I sometimes lose patience with some of our dear sisters in those organizations that sob and sympathize with the "poor alien." Sobbing with the alien or over the alien will not help him or us. To that class of people I say: "We foreigners do not want sympathy, we want opportunity."

That is what I want to give the alien who comes to this country. An opportunity to work out his own destiny, under the best possible conditions, an opportunity to know America and all that America means, an opportunity to become a real citizen of a better nation.

My recent experiences with international law have been from the point of view of this immigration problem. And the point of view is the vital thing after all. Talking with the Chief Justice here a few moments ago, I told him the story of two laborers working side by side. One of them was doing

about five times the work the other accomplished. The boss came up and touched the one that was shirking on the shoulder and said:

"Here, John, what does this mean? Your friend here is producing five times as much as you are. You're not keeping up with him at all."

"That's right," said John, "I have told him about it half a dozen times, but he doesn't pay any attention to me."

So my point of view on international law is undoubtedly limited by my own recent experiences. But I am very glad to have had an opportunity to be with you and to get better acquainted. Some day you may come over to Washington and we will have a chat about international law. For international law is cropping up every day in the Department of Labor. Our three per cent. law, for instance, is stirring international representatives. We were holding a conference on the three per cent. law the other day, and after the meeting, one of the business men who attended came to me and said, confidentially:

"Well this has been strange to me. I didn't know what they were talking about at first—that three per cent. immigration law up in Congress. I thought they were discussing that three per cent. for another purpose."

I have been very happy to be with you. I am sorry my old friend, Professor Hart, is not here. He is one of God's noblemen, and I am always delighted to meet his friends and to talk with him and those who are close to him. I am very glad to have had this opportunity to be with you and to know you.

The TOASTMASTER. As the head of an institution of learning, I am very glad to know that the speaker who has just taken his seat is a graduate of the same university as Abraham Lincoln, "The University of Hard Knocks." Anybody who applies to the work in that institution brains and energy and ambition is sure to get a pretty good education; and I think that the Secretary of Labor is entitled to a degree that we here might bestow upon him.

One thing he said reminds me of a friend of mine in the State of New York, my native State. A few years ago a gentleman of considerable wealth in the manufacturing industry, who had three daughters, told me that he had each one of those girls learn a trade. One learned to be a dress-maker. I forget what the others did. But each one had to learn a trade until she could earn a living by it. Now, he said, I don't know what their future may be. They may marry. Their husbands may fail in business, and there is nothing more hopeless in this world than a woman whose husband has failed, or died, and who without any training for it is compelled to rely upon herself for support. My girls are not going to be left that way. Whether they marry or not they have to be independent, and so they are taught a trade. And so I think myself every American boy or girl ought to have a trade that they can fall back upon. I wish I had one myself, Mr. Secretary.

I am now going to call on a member of our national legislature. We all look to the Hill above us here as a source of sweetness and light! And one exponent of that will speak to us tonight, the Honorable Henry W. Temple, of the Committee of Foreign Affairs, and therefore, of course, one of our own circle.

ADDRESS BY THE HON. HENRY W. TEMPLE

Member of the House of Representatives, and Member of the Committee of Foreign Affairs

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen: I envy the Chief Justice; not for the first time, I may say, but particularly this evening I envy him his place on the program. I had hoped to listen to him first, and then, having at least had an opportunity to catch some of his inspiration, to speak under its influence. It cannot be supposed that he had any like purpose in selecting the last place on the program, but if he had, I fear his hopes are doomed to disappointment. Mine would not have been if I could have spoken after him.

I have been interested in the discussions to which I have listened during the last few days at the meetings of the Society of International Law, and in the spirit which I have observed there. Many of you are not only students of the law of nations but also men of large experience in government and international affairs. There is an opportunity now for the members of this Society such as seldom comes. There has been an earthquake that shook the world and almost destroyed large portions of it. It seemed to be shattering the very foundations of civilization, and at the beginning its hardest blow was struck against international law. It is to men like the members of this Society that the world must look for guidance in rebuilding the structure.

Reference has been made to the men on the Hill, where there is so much sweetness and light. We have been interested in the subjects of which you are students, but we were told that there was not going to be any more international law, that those of us who had given some study to it had wasted our time, that in the future nations would be governed by the doctrine of military necessity and in emergencies would disregard international law, so that the world must give up all hope of orderly development under the influence of law, because there would be no law for the control of nations in their dealings with one another. Well, it was not true. International law was hit hard during the war, but it comes out of the struggle with bright prospects. It will be a long, long time before any nation, drunk with its own power, will challenge the conscience of mankind again.

America cannot stand aloof from the settlements that are to come. We must shoulder our share of the world's load. There is hardly any difference of opinion among the people of this country with regard to that, though we may differ considerably as to the attitude we should take—the means we

should use in carrying our share of the burden. We know well enough that the world is not built, like a modern steamship, in separate water-tight compartments; and if it were, this compartment would go to the bottom with the ship if the others should fill. America cannot be indifferent to the danger; it threatens the whole world, and we are a part of the world. The danger still threatens and threatens seriously. It will take thought, not mere impulsive action to overcome that danger—the thought of men like the members of this organization, who will give much consideration to the great problems of the time, studying not only laws but even more deeply considering institutions which are the full expression of laws.

I confess I have more confidence in principles and institutions developed by experience and rooted in the past than I have in institutions invented under pressure to meet a special situation. The principle that has already laid hold on men's minds, the law that such a principle suggests to the leaders among the nations, will control the development of institutions, but the invented institution, devised to meet a particular situation, is almost certainly doomed to failure.

I do not know that I ought to say so in the presence of so many special students of such matters, but I have sometimes thought that of all the instrumentalities of government established by the Constitution of the United States, there is only one which had no roots in our own past history, and it proved to be the only piece of our governmental machinery which did not work the way it was intended to. Perhaps everything else in our Constitution was inherited, for our institutions have their roots in the land that was the mother country of the founders of America. They were modified, developed, and adapted to the unfamiliar conditions which arose in the new world, but their origin was on the other side of the Atlantic. New England town government was a modification of the parish government of Old England; county government in Virginia was an adaptation of English county government. When the States came together in 1787 to create a central government, they did what their ancestors had done who first came to the colonies—they set up the only kind of government they knew, the kind they had been living under previous to that time.

Practically everything they required was already familiar to them. There was one exception, however. They had determined not to adopt the principle of hereditary monarchy, and it became necessary to find a way to select a chief magistrate. They invented the Electoral College. Oh, that institution may have been suggested by the College of Cardinals which elects the Pope, or by the College of Electors who chose the Emperor for the Holy Roman Empire; but even if it was not an absolutely new invention, even if it be true that it was more or less consciously a reminiscence of one or the other or both of these, it had no roots in our own past. Now, the purpose and intention of the men who invented or devised the Electoral College was that its members should be men of wide acquaintance among

public men, that they should come together in each State without instructions, and in the exercise of their own judgment vote for the man whom they thought best fitted to hold the office of chief magistrate. How did it actually work? What do we do now? Why, we hold national conventions and each party nominates a candidate to whom candidates for members of the Electoral College are pledged. One man may say, "I voted for Harding," another may say, "I voted for Cox." As a matter of fact, neither of them voted for Mr. Harding or for Mr. Cox. They voted for men whose names they have forgotten or did not know at the time. These unknown men went to the various meetings of the electors in the several States and voted for the man they were pledged to. There is no law that required them to do so. The Constitution of the United States knows nothing of the nominee of a national convention. A member of the Electoral College might have voted for Smith or Jones, if he had chosen to do so, instead of the man nominated by the national convention of his party, and there would have been no penalty,—except that he would not have dared to go home.

The unwritten law is stronger than that which is written. If an invented institution does not express the political genius of the people, that genius will find a way to express itself in spite of the institution. So when we discuss the affairs of the whole wide world, we should be careful that the solutions which we devise for the problems that trouble us have roots in the past and are derived from principles so generally accepted that they will appeal to the experience of every member of the family of nations. We must keep what we have, hold fast to that which we have already achieved, maintain the principles of international law that have already been recognized, and let the development from these be a natural development.

In times like these changes may come fast. The law is a living thing, and the quick, new growth may be tender. We may be able to train it as we train a vine on a trellis; we may somewhat control its growth and the form it is going to take; but if it grows from the old root and has the old life in it, it is likely to be a much more useful thing than an artificial vine with no life at all.

I do not intend to occupy more time, but I do want to say that there are a good many men up on the Hill that are thinking as you are about these matters, hoping for progress, striving for it, and we do expect the members of this Society, among other leaders, to show us something of the light.

THE TOASTMASTER. Mr. Temple has given us some very sound principles, I am sure; and I may perhaps be permitted to divulge a secret in saying that I am looking myself just now for a candidate for a position in international law in the University of Chicago, and I think it might be very desirable to promote the Congressman! He says he taught the subject for seven years in another institution. You see he certainly is trained in international law.

The next in the order—of course we have not yet come to the speech about nothing,—the next is Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, of Harvard, a good friend of many of us and a good friend of the Secretary's and mine for many years back. We have great regret that he is not here. Have you any message from him, Dr. Scott?

Dr. JAMES BROWN SCOTT. Mr. Toastmaster, I have a series of letters in his very characteristic vein. After leading us into the belief that he would be with us tonight, and charm us as of yore, and bidding us to invite his friend, the Secretary of Labor, whom we were sure would come if he knew that Mr. Hart was to grace the occasion, he discovered, or his physician discovered, that he had a very sore arm, so that it was thought to be inadvisable for him to come at this time. His heart I understand is good, but his limbs are very weak and feeble.

The TOASTMASTER. His heart is all right, his head and his tongue are all right; what difference does the arm make? Then we shall have to excuse our good friend, Mr. Hart, tonight. We are very sorry he is not here—all of us. Now we come to the closing speech. I have heard the Chief Justice speak many times. Yet never at any time that I have heard him speak has he spoken as he indicates that he is going to talk to us tonight—about nothing at all! It will be the first time that I have heard the Chief Justice talk on so quaint a subject, and it is with great interest and much curiosity that I introduce the Chief Justice of the United States, Hon. William Howard Taft.

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM H. TAFT
Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen of the American Society of International Law: I do not know whether I am a member of this Society or not. If I am not, it is an exceptional society. When I had the invitation to come here from Dr. Scott, I wrote to him that I would come if I did not have to make a speech; that it would be in the evening after a conference with my eight brethren of four or five hours, which while a very delightful session, would take all the vitality there is in me out of me. When you lock nine men into one room and have to reach conclusions, the result is just a bit exhausting. Therefore, I thought that Dr. Scott, because he is a kindly looking man, he is a man of kindly manner,—would really regard my request; and I hoped that seated next to the presiding officer who then I expected to be Mr. Elihu Root, I thought I could appeal to him as an old friend to let me out. I came here to find instead the head of an institution, a great university, who is in the habit of running things himself, and is not in the habit of excusing a man who is not prepared. This is my apology for coming before you with so little to claim your attention.

It has been very pleasant to meet so many distinguished people interested in a subject so vital to the happiness of the world. It has been a great.

pleasure for me to hear the Secretary of Labor, who is charged with the responsibility primarily of seeing who shall come into this country, and who shall stay out. I have no doubt that his administration will be a successful one. There is only one danger in that he is a Welshman, and I fear he may think that the rest of the world may have the same capacity for getting on that the Welsh have, and that he may lose a little sense of proportion with reference to the difficulties others labor under who have not that power of making other people do what they wish them to do. We have a Secretary of State who comes from—not immediately, but through an ancestry—from Wales. Then on the other side they do not seem to be able to get on without the Welsh. Now if the Secretary of Labor sets a Welsh standard of the kind of aliens we are to get in, we will keep out most of the world.

I felt, however, that I should come in answer to this invitation, because since I have been associated with my friend Scott, I know that he regards the institution of which I have now the honor—undeserved honor—of being the head, as exhibit A in international law. If I may judge of the volumes of our decisions that he has put upon the poor students of international law, I should think that our court would be regarded with a great deal of concern by those who are to study the subject. He draws much from our opinions, as evidence of what can be done in the world, if you will only have a Supreme Court of the world. We do administer international law, and we have every little while an example of the foresight—I hope it may be called—of our ancestors in making provisions for such an international tribunal within the Constitution. The Articles of Confederation first gave us the idea, and it was followed in the Constitution.

That story of Connecticut and Pennsylvania fighting out the question of their controverted titles in Wyoming Valley is perhaps the first instance of a real settlement by a court that we have had in this country of international matters. They fought out the question, there were seven judges that heard all the arguments on both sides at Trenton, and then they decided the case for Pennsylvania flat, without a word of reason. They just registered their vote, and Pennsylvania took title. But if you will follow the legislative proceedings thereafter, you will find that within a very few days there was filed in Congress a grant from the State of Connecticut of its possessions clear from Connecticut to the South Sea given it by Charles the Second, a most generous donation of what they did not have, with a reservation which was the negro in the wood pile. It was a reservation of all that part of the territory so generously granted which lay west of the western boundary of Pennsylvania, and ran some hundreds of miles along Lake Erie, about the width of Connecticut. This they retained for themselves, never having had it before.

You will observe that in the legislative history delegates from Pennsylvania favored the acceptance of the grant which included in the acceptance the confirmation of the reservation. Which only goes to show that in

Connecticut—I now date from Connecticut—we kill cats in other ways than by choking them with butter. Now that was a great judicial and international settlement.

And we are having today now in court, which amuses me, another instance of some of that same international aptitude. The State of Massachusetts is suing in our courts to get back some land on the floor of Lake Ontario which it acquired from New York by a treaty of Hartford in 1786. Massachusetts ordinarily does not wait quite so long before getting a dividend, but for some reason or other they have turned up just at a time when Rochester wants this land under the water in Lake Ontario for the purpose of a park. That is a good time to get in, when somebody else wants what originally was not so desirable.

A controversy also has arisen between Oklahoma and Texas, and that, seriously, is an instance of the usefulness of such a tribunal. The bed of the Red River up to date has never been full of usefulness; at least one was not able to discover it until oil was found lying under the river bed between Oklahoma and Texas. That made both Oklahomans and Texans feel that the rights of sovereign states should be preserved. And when an Oklahoman and a Texan wish to preserve those rights and they conflict, it is a very useful tribunal that keeps them apart.

No one knows what is going to happen after the Great War. It is a little more difficult to prophesy now than it was before the war. I hope we shall have reason to be thankful that out of this dreadful welter of blood, this dreadful destruction, we shall derive some lessons which will drive deep into the hearts of men the necessity of having law between nations that shall be observed. The lessons that are being taught today with reference to the attitude of Russia, which has repudiated all obligations to any other nation, has refused to recognize any obligations, the plight that nation is in, and the lessons that are being taught her and her representatives as to the disadvantages they labor under by reason of having lost the confidence of other nations, are something that I hope will be carried to the hearts of all men, so that the necessity for international law and the recognition of its obligations may be brought more clearly home to all nations than they have ever been before.

I am an optimist. I feel that out of all this we are going to get an advance—not a radical advance, because that is not the way that real progress comes. It comes step by step. The progress that is radical usually involves a good deal of retracing. It is discouraging at times to look out upon the world and note how difficult nations broken by war find it to reestablish peaceful and prosperous conditions, yet as time goes on, while we are discussing what must be done in order to make things better, things are working while we sleep. Men have to live, men have to have communities in which to live, and men have to work in order that they shall live. In doing this they are gradually recovering in the light of the lessons that have

been taught by these dreadful disasters which they have endured and which I doubt not will make them cautious hereafter. They will give a sense of value of those things that make for conservatism, for peace, for observation of the obligations that each man owes to every other man, of obligations that all nations owe to one another. In lessons thus taught we shall find the growth and development of international law with more sanction behind it.

Now we have a court in the League of Nations. It is a great institution. It is an institution that I doubt not will make much for the benefit of the world. It is an institution in which we have a great and worthy American representative. It is established on broad principles. We should take pride in the fact that its machinery was worked out with the genius and experience of the man than whom no one stands higher in the field of international law, our own Elihu Root. That court is an American invention and it derives its strength from American tradition, and I sincerely hope that we are working towards it.

The TOASTMASTER. I have not been disappointed; the Chief Justice has added another to the list of speeches that I have heard from him, all of which have substance and something for thought. The Chief Justice has shown himself, also, to be a man of wit, and we thank him for coming here tonight and for helping us in our deliberations.

I believe, ladies and gentlemen, that this closes the meeting of the Society. I suppose that Charles Dickens is not an authority on international law, and my students tell me that he is no longer an authority in literature. But I am going back to quote Charles Dickens in conclusion, by saying simply—"God bless us every one!"

We stand adjourned.